DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 362 UD 012 044

TITLE	An Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 70
NOTE	83p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary School Students; *Private Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Reinforcement; Remedial Reading; Secondary School Students
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

In order to alleviate the problems with reading which many children in non-public schools located in impacted poverty neighborhoods have, corrective reading services for these children have been instituted by the New York City Board of Education under ESEA Title I. As of August 1970, approximately 158 non-public schools in disadvantaged areas of New York City are receiving corrective reading services. This program is being offered at both the elementary and secondary levels. The project is in its fourth full year of operation. This final report is restricted to the operations of the program during the 1969-1970 school year. It includes a description of the project's implementation, an evaulation of the program by the professional staff, the parents, and the pupils who participated in the programs, and an overall assessment of the project's effectiveness. The major objectives of the program were: (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (3) to make the corrective reading work more effective by encouraging reinforcement of reading work in the home classroom; and, (4) to encourage parents to actively participate in the pupils' reading program. Evaulation data was collected from a stratified sample of 30 schools, proportionally representing each type of school receiving program services. (Author/JM)

ED 058362

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services For Disadvantaged Pupils In Non-Public Schools

UD 012 044

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1969-70 school year.

Professor Leonore Ringler
Project Director

UD 012 044

CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH
AND SCHOOL SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

August, 1970

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses
51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

August 31, 1970

Dr. Samuel D. McClelland
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY
OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. McClelland:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated February 6, 1970 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit two hundred and fifty copies of the final report, An Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under Title I, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the Schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:n

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The director of this evaluation project would like to thank the following individuals whose assistance was invaluable. Evaluation consultants, Dr. Elazar Pedhazur of the New York University School of Education and Dr. Laura Bursuk of York College; graduate assistants, Isaac Balogun, Eleanor Blustain, Elaine Epstein, Carol Hosaka, Elaine Kleinbart, Ruth Meyers, and Janice Wolf who carried out the field observations and data collection for this report.

The work of Beth Green who contributed extensively of her time while an Anderson Fellow in the School of Education is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally an expression of deep appreciation to the teachers and administrators of the non-public schools and to the Title I corrective reading teachers and supervisory staff. Special thanks to Miss Bernadette Pepin, Title I project coordinator, without whose cooperation this report would not be possible.

L.R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iii
INTRODUCTION 1
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES 2
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES 2
EVALUATION PROCEDURES 2
DESCRIPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM 4
- General Findings 5
- Rating of Schools 11

READING TEACHERS' BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE 14
IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF READING TEACHERS 16
STAFF EVALUATIONS OF THE PROGRAM 21
- Reading Teachers 21
- Classroom Teachers 24
- Principals 26
- Reading Supervisors 28

PARENTS' REACTION TO PROGRAM 30
PUPIL EVALUATION 33
- Evaluation of Classroom Teacher 34
- Self-evaluation by Secondary School Pupils 36
- Evaluation of Pupils' Gains 38
- Comparisons Between Two Programs 40

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 43

APPENDIX A Observer Check List

APPENDIX B Reading Teacher Background Form

APPENDIX C Reading Teacher in–Service Training Questionnaire

APPENDIX D Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

APPENDIX E Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

APPENDIX F Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

APPENDIX G Reading Supervisor Interview Form

APPENDIX H Parent Letter and Questionnaire

APPENDIX I Pupil Evaluation Form

APPENDIX J Pupil Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Schools Selected for Site Visit by District and Code	4
2.	Observers' Check List	6
3.	Mean Ratings of 30 Schools in Seven Areas	12
4.	Summary of Mean Ratings of 30 Schools	13
5.	Educational Background of Reading Teachers	14
6.	Relevant Courses Taken by Reading Teachers	15
7.	Teaching Experience of Reading Teachers	17
8.	Number of Field Visits by Supervisors and Project Coordinator	18
9.	In-Service Training Sessions Frequencies of Attendance and General Impressions	19
10.	Evaluation of Training Sessions–Corrective Reading Teachers	20
11.	Evaluation of the Program–Corrective Reading Teachers	22
12.	Participation and General Impressions–Corrective Reading Teachers	23
13.	Evaluation of the Program–Classroom Teachers	24
14.	Pupil Participation and General Impressions–Classroom Teachers	25
15.	Evaluation of Program–Principals	27
16.	Evaluation of the Reading Program–Supervisors and Project Coordinator	29
17.	Parents' Responses	31
18.	Classroom Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils	34
19.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils	35
20.	Background Characteristics–Pupils in Grades 7 – 10	36
21.	Evaluation of the Program–Pupils in Grades 7 – 10	37
22.	Test of Significance of Gains in Reading	39
23.	Analysis of Covariance of Gains in Work Knowledge	42
24.	Analysis of Covariance of Gains in Paragraph Meaning	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation of corrective reading services in the non-public schools contains three major components. The report has (1) described the implementation of the program in a stratified sample of 30 schools; (2) assessed the reactions of the professional staff, and parents to the program; (3) considered several aspects of pupil evaluation including an analysis of reading test scores.

The data collected yield the following conclusions:

1. Observation of the program in a stratified sample of 30 schools indicates that the program was implemented in both the elementary and secondary schools as outlined in the project proposal.
2. Rating of the 30 schools in respect to their physical facilities, pupil evaluation, materials, planning, teaching procedures, and the functioning of the teachers and pupils in the program show a good deal of variability across the schools. In general, the pattern of ratings tend toward the higher ratings with the exception of physical facilities which were rated low for seven schools.
3. Assessment of reading teachers' background and experience indicates that the majority of the teachers have taken courses relevant to the teaching of corrective reading but have limited experience in teaching reading. This lack of experience is expected in the light of the guidelines used to select Title I teachers.
4. Training of the reading teachers was extensive and well implemented. The majority of the reading teachers reported that the training they received was relevant to their work in the reading program.
5. Evaluation of the program by field supervisors, reading teachers, classroom teachers and principals was generally favorable. The item that received the lowest rating dealt with parental involvement. The overwhelming majority of the professional staff expressed the desire to participate in a similar program next year.
6. Reaction of parents to the program was positive although their actual involvement was minimal. The majority of the parents considered the program helpful and wanted it to be continued.

7. Evaluation by the classroom teachers of their pupils who attended the reading program indicated that there was about "average improvement" in areas concerned with reading ability, other school subjects, study habits, outside assignments, and attitude toward school.
8. Self-evaluation by secondary school pupils showed a positive response toward the program. However, a relatively large number of pupils (35 per cent) indicated that they did not wish to participate in a similar program next year.
9. Analysis of reading test scores yielded significant gains from initial to final scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (grades 2 through 8) and on the Iowa Silent Reading Test (grades 9 -- 10). However, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons.
10. Comparisons between the two different programs (five days a week remedial work and two days a week) did not yield any significant differences. The groups involved in this analysis were relatively small and many variables other than the number of days a week the program was conducted may have been in operation.

In summary, then, the reading program was favorably perceived by the evaluation team, the professional staff, parents and pupils. An analysis of the reading test scores attests to the overall effectiveness of the program.

The following specific recommendations are made with a view toward improving a sound program:

1. A controlled experimental study to be conducted and that the design for the program be developed prior to the initial selection of the pupils for the remedial program.
2. The experimental five days a week program be expanded to several additional schools and that a controlled experiment be set up prior to its inception.
3. Priority in the selection of new pupils entering the remedial program to be given to children in second and third grade. The research literature indicates that younger children tend to respond better to remedial instruction than older children.

4. Methods for increasing parental involvement in the program be studied. Some possibilities are parent observation of the reading program, parent work shops or teacher-parent conferences during evening hours, increased participation of CRT in regular school meetings which involve parents, brief written progress reports on a monthly basis, a school newsletter highlighting reading activities outside of the classroom, and the organization of a parent committee. A parent group might work with the CRT to develop some plans for increasing parent participation in the remedial reading program.
5. In-service training for the school year 1970-71 to stress the following: planning for small group and individual pupil needs, ways of attaining greater pupil interaction, methods of eliciting information from pupils, techniques for fostering independent reading and methods of increasing parental involvement.
6. The concept of a reading laboratory be considered for the secondary schools in an attempt to change the negative attitude of many of these pupils toward attending remedial reading classes. Consideration might be given to permitting pupils other than those specifically selected for remedial work to use the reading laboratory on a voluntary basis. This type of setup might offset some of the stigma attached to remedial reading classes.
7. Coordination between reading activities in the regular classroom and in the reading room be improved. Scheduled weekly conferences between the CRT and the non-public school teacher and/or observation of the reading program by the classroom teacher might be considered.
8. Staff assignments be adjusted where possible so that only one reading teacher would service a given school. It is further recommended that teachers in 1970-71 return to the same school they served in 1969-70 so as to insure program continuity.
9. Additional audio-visual materials and library books about minority groups be given to the remedial reading program. In addition, it is suggested that the Informal Textbook Test be revised.
10. The physical facilities in those schools that were rated below average be upgraded.

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES
IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Introduction

Many children in non-public schools located in impacted poverty neighborhoods have reading problems and are deficient in reading. In order to alleviate this problem, corrective reading services for these children have been instituted by the New York City Board of Education under Title I ESEA. At this time approximately 158 non-public schools in disadvantaged areas of New York City are receiving corrective reading services. This program is being offered at both the elementary and secondary levels.

The New York City Board of Education recruits, trains, and assigns licensed teachers for the corrective reading program in the non-public schools. During the 1969-70 school year thirty-four regular teachers served on a five day a week basis and an additional 106 per diem teachers were involved in the program. Seven field supervisors fulfilling six alloted positions and a reading coordinator designated by the Board of Education were responsible for teacher training, supervision, and overall coordination of the program.

Approximately 8,810 pupils received the services of the Title I corrective reading teachers. It is to be noted that an additional 3,000 pupils could not be serviced by the staff and were placed on a waiting list. Children in grades one through twelve who were more than one standard deviation below norm achieved on a standardized reading test were recommended for corrective reading service by the non-public school principal. The screening of applicants was done by the Title I corrective reading teacher (CRT). Eligible pupils received small group instruction based on a diagnosis of reading disabilities.

The project is in its fourth full year of operation. Formal evaluation of the 1969-70 school year program began in late January with a series of site visits. The evaluation was concluded at the end of the spring semester in June, 1970. This final report is restricted to the operations of the program during the 1969-1970 school year. It includes a description of the project's implementation, an evaluation of the program by the professional staff, the parents, and the pupils who participated in the program, and an overall assessment of the project's effectiveness.

Program Objectives

The major objectives of the program as outlined in the project proposal were as follows: (1) to increase proficiency in reading; (2) to increase general achievement and stimulate motivation for school work by improving reading skills; (3) to make the corrective reading work more effective by encouraging reinforcement of reading work in the home classroom; and (4) to encourage parents to actively participate in the pupils' reading program.

Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation focused on the degree to which the objectives noted above were met. The major evaluation objectives were:

1. To describe and evaluate the implementation of the program.
2. To determine to what extent the program increased proficiency in reading.
3. To note the effect of the corrective reading program on the general achievement of the pupils and their motivation for schoolwork.
4. To determine the effectiveness of the program as perceived by the reading teachers, classroom teachers, school principals, and reading supervisors.
5. To assess the degree of parental involvement in the program.

In addition to the above the evaluation team addressed itself to the following secondary objectives:

6. To determine the background and experience of the reading teachers.
7. To evaluate the in-service training of the reading teachers.
8. To compare the reading achievement of a group meeting five times a week for remedial work with a group meeting twice a week.
9. To determine the attitude of secondary school pupils to the reading program.

Evaluation Procedures

To meet the stated evaluation objectives, specific procedures were developed by the director of the evaluation project and the evaluation consultants. In order to describe and evaluate the implementation of the program a stratified sample of 30 schools, proportionally representing the schools in each code group, was selected. While all schools received and responded to some of the instruments developed for the purpose of the evaluation, only the thirty schools selected were visited and observed by the evaluation staff. An Observer Check List to be used during all site visits was developed by the evaluation team.

Detailed questionnaires and rating scales were prepared to assess the reactions of all personnel connected with the project. In addition questionnaires to determine the background and experience of the corrective reading teachers were developed. Instruments designed for this aspect of the evaluation are as follows: Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire, Reading Teacher Background Form, Reading Teacher In-service Training Questionnaire, Principal Evaluation Questionnaire, Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire, Reading Supervisor Evaluation Questionnaire, and Parent Questionnaire.

Several aspects of pupil evaluation were considered. To note the effect of the corrective reading program on the general achievement of pupils and their motivation for school work, a Pupil Evaluation Form was developed for use by the classroom teacher. Standardized test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test were obtained from the Title I project coordinator and were analyzed to determine pupils' increased proficiency in reading. In addition, a simple Pupil Questionnaire was prepared to note the attitude of the secondary school pupils to the corrective reading program. Copies of all instruments designed for this evaluation are included in the appendices to this report.

Following the construction of the instruments noted above and their approval by the Title I standing committee of the non-public schools, the project director conducted a training session with the graduate assistants to be employed in the site visits. The items on the Observer Check List were interpreted in detail so that standard procedures would be used during the classroom observations. Site visits to the selected sample of non-public schools began on January 27, 1970, and continued through May 18, 1970.

Questionnaires and explanatory covering letters were mailed to corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, principals, and parents during the month of May, 1970. The Pupil Evaluation Form was filled out by the classroom teacher during May, 1970, and the Pupil Questionnaire (Grades 7 – 12) was administered by the evaluation team and the corrective reading teachers during the last two weeks in May and the first week in June, 1970. The Title I reading supervisors and Title I project coordinator were interviewed by the evaluation project director during the second week of June, 1970. Test data were obtained from the Board of Education on June 29, 1970.

A detailed analysis of data collected is presented below in the following order: description and implementation of program; background, experience, and in-service training of corrective reading teachers; evaluation of program by corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, principals, and Title I supervisors; reactions of parents; and finally data from Pupil Evaluation Form, Pupil Questionnaire, and Corrective Reading Progress Report.

Description and Implementation of Program

The corrective reading program in the non-public schools was organized so that small groups of retarded readers are able to receive specialized reading instruction. In the elementary school children in grades one through eight met in groups of ten with the corrective reading teacher for two hours a week. As an experimental project in two schools, pupils met for five sessions a week. In a few schools in which service is limited to one day a week due to small enrollments, pupils met in a group of five for one weekly session of reading instruction. Similar organizational patterns held in the secondary schools.

In the early elementary grades, beginning-to-read skills and decoding were emphasized. In the upper elementary grades, comprehension and study skills were added to decoding skills. Word attack skills were emphasized for all pupils reading on primary level regardless of grade placement. In addition, independent study habits were stressed as preparation for academic work in the secondary school. In the secondary school, the emphasis was on establishing competency in content areas, organization of material, and the ability to handle homework assignments. Instruction in advanced comprehension and vocabulary skills was continued at this level.

As was noted above, a stratified sample of 30 schools, proportionally representing the schools in the six codes, was selected for site visits, in order to note the implementation of the program. For a breakdown of the schools involved in the site visits see Table 1.

Table 1
Schools Selected for Site Visits by District and Code.
N = 30

Code	Frequency	Districts
1	12	2(1)[a], 3(2), 4(2), 5(1), 6(1), 7(3), 10(1), 12(1)
2	10	13(3), 14(2), 15(2), 16(1), 17(1), 30(1)
3	4	14(2), 18(1), 21(1)
4	2	8(1), 15(1)
5	1	16(1)
6	1	16(1)

[a]number in parentheses refers to number of schools selected in the district.

The six codes noted in Table 1 designate the affiliation of the non-public school system as follows:

Code 1 – Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of New York

Code 2 – Catholic Schools, Diocese of Brooklyn

Code 3 – Hebrew Day Schools

Code 4 – Greek Orthodox Schools

Code 5 – Lutheran Schools

Code 6 – Episcopal Schools

In addition to the six codes listed above, there is a code 7 referring to Ukranian Catholic Schools. The selection procedure did not include any Code 7 school due to the fact that the one school in that code is not yet receiving corrective reading services.

For the site visits a team of observers visited the various schools and observed the work of the reading teacher with different groups of pupils. The observers used an Observer Check List to record the conditions noted in the ongoing program. In addition, they rated each aspect on a five-point scale ranging from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory." In this way the reading programs in the 30 schools were rated in respect to their physical facilities, pupil evaluation, materials, planning, teaching procedures, and the functioning of the teachers and pupils in the program.

The observers' findings are reported in two parts. The first deals with the various aspects across the 30 schools visited; the second reports the mean rating of each school in each of the categories.

General findings across schools. The number of observations in the various schools ranged from two to ten. It is to be noted that in those schools which received a minimum number of observations, the reading services were limited to one day a week and generally were scheduled after the regular school day. In Table 2 are reported the findings in each category across the 30 schools.

Table 2

Observers' Check List

N = 30[a]

A. Physical Facilities	Frequency[b]	Percent
1. Separate area for reading program	28	93
2. Size of area adequate	24	80
3. Space available for small group work	23	77
4. Space available for individual work	23	77
5. Storage facilities adequate	25	83
6. Chalkboard available	27	90
7. Area attractive	26	87
8. Adequate physical provisions (lights, ventilation, etc.)	21	70
B. Materials		
1. Variety of materials being used.		
a. Basal readers	5	17
b. Workbooks	13	43
c. Trade books	25	83
d. Magazines	18	60
e. Newspapers	26	87
f. Content-area materials	3	10
g. Other	21	70
2. Teacher-made materials	26	87
3. Audio-visual aids	12	40
4. Interest level appropriate to age and maturity of pupils	28	93

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Observers' Check List

N = 30[a]

		Frequency[b]	Percent
5.	Level of materials suitable to reading ability of pupils	26	87
6.	Differentiation between instructional level and independent level materials	13	43
7.	Attractive in appearance	29	97
8.	Sufficient quantity	26	87
C.	**Evaluation**		
1.	Use of Informal Reading Inventory	27	90
2.	Standardized Reading Test upon admission to program	27	90
3.	Standardized Reading Test at end of school year	29	97
4.	On-going informal evaluation of errors in work recognition	22	73
5.	On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	15	50
6.	Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills	7	23

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Observers' Check List

N = 30[a]

	Frequency[b]	Percent
D. Planning		
1. Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	25	83
2. Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	23	77
3. Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	12	40
4. Application materials and assignments differentiated for individual and group needs	8	27
E. Teaching Procedures		
1. Background, readiness, or concept building where appropriate to lesson	28	93
2. Specific skill teaching in		
a. work recognition	26	87
b. comprehension	25	83
c. study skills	10	33
3. Appropriate application following development of a specific skill	23	77
4. Questions differentiated to include various types of meanings – literal, interpretation, critical evaluation	17	57

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Observers' Check List N = 30[a]	Frequency[b]	Percent
5. Grouping of activities (small group or individual) for special needs	6	20
6. Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	25	83
7. Use of class time – spacing, number	25	83
8. Integration of reading with content areas	6	20
F. The Teacher		
1. Appears enthusiastic	30	100
2. Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	30	100
3. Encourages all pupils to participate	28	93
4. Instills confidence in pupils – uses positive reinforcement	28	93
G. The Pupils		
1. Arrive promptly for reading instruction	22	73
2. Actively respond during reading period	29	97
3. Interaction among pupils	23	77
4. Show interest in independent reading	18	60

[a] Number of schools involved in site visits

[b] Frequency indicates the number of schools in which an area was observed

Rather than attempt to exhaust the information in Table 2, only main issues will be noted under the separate headings.

Physical Facilities

It will be noted that in general the majority of schools provided the corrective reading teacher with a separate area for reading instruction that was adequate. In those schools with poor physical facilities the reading teachers adapted very well to their surroundings. The weakest item appeared to be poorly ventilated rooms.

Materials

In almost all cases there was a totally adequate supply of reading materials. Generally, the materials were suitable to both the interest level and the reading level of the pupils. Additional audio-visual aids and library books about minority groups might be considered to supplement the extensive materials that are available.

Evaluation

The ITT and the standardized silent reading tests are used by virtually all the reading teachers. It should be noted that the ITT is several years old and a revision of this instrument seems necessary at this point since some children continue in the program for several years. Diagnosis of comprehension and study skills was observed less frequently than word recognition. This is understandable as the emphasis in the program is on word attack skills for all pupils reading at the primary level.

Planning

Teacher planning and outside preparation appeared to be extensive. Teacher-prepared materials, charts, and bulletin board displays were found in almost all classrooms. The major weakness in this area is in planning for individual needs through the use of small groups within the larger reading group. Also, the use of differing application materials and assignments to meet skill needs of pupils was observed in only 8 of the 30 schools.

Teaching Procedures

For the most part teachers were skilled in presenting guided reading lessons and in the teaching of word recognition skill lessons. Teachers differentiated their questions to include various types of meanings although the emphasis did appear to be on literal questions. Additional teacher training might stress abilities involved in developing a skill lesson with special emphasis on how to elicit information from pupils and on making pupils aware of what they are to learn. As noted above, in the section on planning teaching procedures in the majority of the schools did not include individual or small group activities.

The Teacher

On the basis of the observations the teachers were enthusiastic about their program and were successful in communicating this enthusiasm to the pupils.

The Pupils

In the majority of the schools, the pupils appeared to respond positively to the reading program. Increased interaction among the pupils and a greater interest in independent reading would be desirable. However, these are long term goals and not easily attained with a group of deficient readers.

Rating of Schools. In Table 3 are reported the mean ratings of each school in each of the seven areas observed. As can be noted from Table 3, there is a good deal of variability in the ratings across the schools.

TABLE 3

Mean Ratings of 30 Schools

In Seven Areas

Schools	Physical Facilities	Materials	Evaluation	Planning	Teaching Procedures	The Teacher	The Pupils
1.	3.78	3.89	3.50	3.29	2.87	3.50	3.12
2.	5.00	4.70	4.67	3.62	4.33	4.70	4.30
3.	3.71	4.29	4.00	3.57	3.57	4.43	3.71
4.	4.60	4.00	2.20	2.60	3.40	3.20	3.20
5.	1.67	3.17	3.50	3.33	2.83	3.50	3.33
6.	5.00	4.33	3.50	3.67	4.00	3.83	3.67
7.	3.00	4.60	3.40	3.00	3.60	3.20	3.40
8.	4.00	3.20	2.00	NR[a]	3.00	3.40	2.80
9.	4.33	4.33	3.50	3.33	3.50	4.50	3.67
10.	2.29	3.57	3.50	3.67	3.75	4.29	3.43
11.	5.00	4.17	3.80	3.00	3.17	4.33	4.00
12.	3.50	3.60	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.67	3.17
13.	1.67	3.17	4.00	3.17	3.50	4.00	4.17
14.	4.17	4.17	3.60	3.83	3.50	3.50	3.17
15.	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00
16.	5.00	3.62	3.50	3.14	2.43	3.62	3.50
17.	3.67	3.80	4.50	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.67
18.	3.00	3.80	2.20	2.80	3.00	4.00	2.60
19.	3.25	1.25	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00
20.	3.25	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.33	3.25	3.00
21.	3.20	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.60	3.40	2.80
22.	1.25	NR	NR	NR	NR	3.33	2.67
23.	2.00	3.50	2.25	1.25	1.33	2.50	3.00
24.	4.75	4.50	3.75	3.25	3.50	4.25	3.50
25.	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.67	4.00
26.	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.67	3.33
27.	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.67	3.00
28.	5.00	1.50	4.00	2.50	2.00	4.00	4.00
29.	1.00	2.00	3.00	NR	2.00	2.00	3.00
30.	1.50	4.50	3.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.00

[a]NR indicates no rating in this area

In order to better appreciate the pattern of ratings, Table 4 summarizes them in the following manner: (1) number of schools with ratings of 4 or more; (2) number of schools with ratings of 2 or less; (3) range of ratings. The three categories that received the highest frequencies of rating of 4 or more are: physical facilities – 13; the teacher – 12; materials – 11.

It should be noted however that while physical facilities had the largest frequency of high ratings, it also had the largest frequency of low ratings (7). This indicates a good deal of variability in physical facilities across schools. The range of the ratings was from 1 (the lowest possible) to 5 (the highest possible). From Table 4 it can also be seen that planning and teaching procedures received average ratings most of the time. In general, the pattern of ratings displayed in Table 4 tend toward the higher ratings. In all categories, the frequency of low ratings ranged from 0 to 7, while the frequency of high ratings ranged from 3 to 13.

Reading Teachers' Background and Experience

The evaluation team felt that it was important to study the background of the teachers employed by the Board of Education to serve as reading teachers in the non-public

TABLE 4

Summary of Mean Ratings
of 30 Schools

Area	Frequency of 4+ ratings	Frequency of 2- ratings	Range of ratings
Physical facilities	13	7	1.00-5.00
Materials	11	3	1.25-4.70
Evaluation	6	1	2.00-4.67
Planning	4	1	1.25-4.00
Teaching procedures	3	3	1.33-4.50
The teacher	12	1	2.00-5.00
The pupil	8	0	2.67-4.30

schools. To assess their educational background and teaching experience, particularly as they relate to competencies in the area of reading, a questionnaire was mailed to all corrective reading teachers (137). A total of 106 responses were received.

In Table 5 are summarized the educational background data of the reading teachers. It will be noted that 98% reported having been awarded a B.A. degree, while 2% failed to respond to this question. Thirty eight percent of the group received bachelor's degree in the past decade.

TABLE 5

Educational Background of Reading Teachers
N = 106

Item		Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's Degree	Yes	104	98
	No response	2	2
Date of degree	Before 1950	28	26
	1950-1959	34	32
	1960-1968	40	38
	No response	4	4
Major Field	Reading	3	3
	Other	103	97
Master's Degree	Yes	37	35
	No	63	65
Date of degree	Before 1950	6	16
	1950-1959	9	25
	1960-1970	20	54
	No response	2	5
Major Field	Reading	6	16
	Other	31	84
Doctorate Degree		0	–

Thirty-seven percent of the group reported having been awared a master's degree. Over 50% of these degrees were granted in the past decade. None of the teachers indicated having a degree higher than the Master. Practically all the teachers received their degrees in fields other than reading.

Table 6 reports the course work taken by the reading teachers that is relevant to the teaching of corrective reading.

TABLE 6

Relevant Courses Taken by Reading Teachers
N = 106

Course	Frequency	Percent
Foundations of Reading Instruction	71	67
Date of course: Before 1960	18	25
After 1960	53	75
Diagnostic Techniques in Reading	56	53
Date of course: Before 1960	12	21
After 1960	44	79
Corrective Reading Instruction	48	45
Date of course: Before 1960	9	19
After 1960	39	81
Reading in the Content Areas	36	34
Date of course: Before 1960	12	33
After 1960	24	67
Individualized Reading	29	27
Date of course: Before 1960	9	31
After 1960	20	69
Other Courses Related To Reading	49	46
Date of course: Before 1960	9	18
After 1960	40	82

Sixty-seven percent reported having taken "foundations of reading instruction", 53% indicated that they had taken a course in "diagnostic techniques", and 45% reported having taken "corrective reading instruction". These courses would be most relevant to the teaching of corrective reading. In all categories, the majority of the teachers took course work in the past decade. This would lead one to believe that they are familiar with the most current techniques and approaches to the teaching of reading. Since there is a considerable overlap in the categories dealing with course work, it is interesting to note that only seven teachers reported having taken no course relevant to the teaching of reading, while four teachers reported having taken only a course in the "other" category.

In Table 7 the teaching experience of the corrective reading teacher is reported. Seventy eight percent of the teachers have teaching experience from one to nine years while the remainder have ten or more years of experience. Fifty four percent report having worked as regular teachers, while 46% worked as substitute teachers.

It will be noted that the experience of the teachers in teaching corrective reading is limited. About 50% did not report having had any experiences specific to teaching corrective reading. The category that was checked more than any of the others is teaching of corrective reading in the public schools. Thirty percent of the respondents reported having had this experience. It is interesting to note that out of 32 teachers, 20 reported having had from one to two years of such experience.

This lack of experience in teaching reading is not surprising in light of the guidelines used in selecting Title I teachers for the non-public schools. Recruitment of Title I teachers must not deplete the regular teaching staff in the public schools. Therefore, the teachers selected for the non-public schools come from the ranks of retired teachers, and substitute teachers. Some of the substitute teachers have received regular licenses during the time they have served as Title I teachers. This includes some teachers who were hired from the Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP).

In-Service Training of Reading Teachers

The teacher training program as outlined by the project coordinator and the field supervisors encompassed three major aspects. An orientation program for new teachers focused on pupil selection and screening, diagnostic analysis, and methods and materials for the instructional program. During the 1969-70 school year, forty-six new teachers each received nine hours of training.

TABLE 7

Teaching Experience of Reading Teachers
N = 106

Item		Frequency	Percent
Number of years of teaching experience	1 – 9	78	74
	10 – 19	14	13
	20 +	8	8
	No response	6	5
Teaching license	Regular	57	54
	Substitute	49	46
Experience specific to teaching reading			
Years as CRT in public schools	None	74	70
	1 – 2	20	19
	3 – 4	9	8
	5 +	3	3
Years in after-school tutorial reading program	None	97	92
	1 – 4	9	8
Years as parent-volunteer reading tutor	None	98	92
	1 – 4	7	7
	5 +	1	1
Years in private tutorial reading	None	81	76
	1 – 4	18	17
	5+	7	7

A second aspect of the training program consisted of large group meetings (twenty-five or more participants) and small group meetings for the on-going training of the reading teachers and for administrative direction. Eleven, five-hour, large group meetings were held during this school year. Major topics discussed were decoding, comprehension, diagnostic techniques, and instructional materials. Special areas included the disadvantaged learner, the bi-lingual child and the paraprofessional in the corrective reading program. Demonstration lessons and reports of professional activities in the field of reading were also included in the large group meeting. The small group meetings (less than twenty-five participants) were generally held in the corrective reading room in the non-public school. The major focus at these meetings was the needs of the specific group of reading teachers as evaluated by the field supervisor. Meetings were also used as a follow-up and reinforcement

of material discussed during the large group meetings. At these meetings, there was greater emphasis on teacher participation and demonstration. A total of twenty-five small group meetings (two hours per session) were held during the 1969-70 program. Two of the group meetings were observed by members of the evaluation team. Both meetings were very well planned and implemented. A variety of the topics noted above were covered, and teachers' responses and interactions were excellent.

Field visits by supervisors and the project coordinator complete the teacher training program. Table 8 reports the frequency and range of number of field visits.

TABLE 8

Number of Field Visits by Supervisors and Project Coordinator

	Mean	Range
Full-Time Teachers	12	5 – 20
Part-Time Teachers	9	5 – 19

As of May, 1970 a total of 1,186 field visits were completed by seven supervisors, and the project coordinator. Each visit was of approximately two-hour duration. The major emphasis in these visits was to provide on-the-job training, and to serve as a resource person. In addition, the supervisors acted as a liaison between the project coordinator, reading teacher, and non-public school administrator.

In order to determine the reading teachers' perception of the in-service training, a questionnaire was mailed to all the reading teachers. A total of 106 teachers responded to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts, the first of which dealt with general impressions, while the second part asked for evaluation of specific topics covered during the in-service sessions. The general impressions, as well as frequencies of sessions attended, are summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 9

In-Service Training Sessions
Frequencies of Attendance
and
General Impressions

N = 106

Question		Frequency	Percent
1. How many in-service corrective reading sessions did you attend?	1 – 5	29	27
	6 – 10	38	36
	11 – 15	11	10
	16 – 20	8	8
	21 +	7	7
	No response	13	12
2. How many hours of training did you receive?	1 – 9	8	8
	10 – 19	21	20
	20 – 29	17	16
	30 – 39	8	8
	40 – 49	6	5
	50 – 59	9	9
	60 – 69	10	9
	70 +	13	12
	No response	14	13
3. In your opinion, was the amount of in-service training sufficient?	Yes	79	75
	No response	27	25
4. Did you participate in the corrective reading program last year?	Yes	79	75
	No	27	25
5. Did you participate in the in-service training last year?	Yes	70	66
	No	36	34
6. In comparison to last year's sessions, this year's sessions were, on the whole:	Inferior	3	4
	About the same	35	50
	Superior	30	43
	No response	2	3

The number of in-service sessions attended ranged from one to seventy-five with a median of eight sessions. The number of hours of training received in the sessions ranged from two to 280 with a median of thirty hours. Seventy-five percent of the teachers indicated that the number of in-service training sessions was sufficient, while 25 percent did not respond to this question. It is impossible to determine whether the lack of response indicates no opinion or lack of satisfaction with the amount of training. Of the teachers

involved in this year's program 75 percent reported having taken part in last year's program, and 70 percent indicated having participated in last year's in-service training sessions. It will be noted that of those who participated in last year's and this year's sessions, 4% thought this year's sessions to be inferior to last year's, 50% thought they were about the same, while 43% thought this year's sessions were superior in comparison to last year's sessions.

In the second part of the questionnaire, the reading teachers were asked to rate several areas covered during the training sessions. For each area, the teachers were asked to indicate, on a five-point scale, the degree of relevancy of the information received to their experience in teaching corrective reading. The results are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Evaluation of Training Sessions
Corrective Reading Teachers

N = 106

Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a. Methods of corrective instruction	4.09	.94	100
b. Use of instructional materials	4.04	1.10	99
c. Techniques of evaluation	3.98	.91	100
d. Specific procedures for diagnosis	4.01	1.03	100
e. Techniques for parent involvement	3.56	1.22	100

[a]Number of teachers responding to a given item.

The mean ratings of the five areas are generally favorable, indicating that the teachers believed the information was generally relevant to their experience. It is important to note that the item dealing with parental involvement received the lowest mean rating, i.e. 3.56. This is supported by other aspects of the evaluation, notably the ratings given to parental involvement by the principals and the response of the parents themselves.

Staff Evaluations of the Program

Questionnaires for the evaluation of the reading program were mailed to corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals. The reading supervisors' evaluation of the program was elicited during an interview. The respondents were asked to rate various aspects of the program on a five-point scale from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory".

In addition to the rating scales, corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, and principals who had participated in previous Title I ESEA reading programs were asked to compare this year's program with last year's program. Participants were also asked whether they would be interested in participating in a similar program again. It was hoped in this way to assess the general degree of satisfaction of the professional staff with the program. Respondents were also urged to make comments and recommendations that they wished to make, thus covering aspects that may have been overlooked in the rating scale. An analysis of these data follows:

Reading Teachers. A total of 106 corrective reading teachers rated thirteen aspects of the program. The means and standard deviations for each item are reported in Table 11.

It is evident that the general evaluation of the corrective reading teachers is favorable. Of the thirteen aspects, eleven received ratings above the mean. Among items receiving high ratings were those dealing with selection procedures (a); materials supplied (e and f); cooperation of school personnel (k); and supervision of the program (1).

It is notable that the two items with the lowest ratings deal with the involvement of outside groups in reinforcing the work done by the corrective reading teachers. The item dealing with activities in the home classroom (j) received a mean rating of 2.83. It should be further noted that while most of the teachers rated all other items, only eighty-nine rated item (j). One may surmise that the rest were not sufficiently familiar with the activities in the home classroom to offer a rating.

The item that received the lowest rating dealt with parental involvement (item m, mean = 2.57). This rating is supported by the principals' rating and the parents' comments which indicate very little involvement in the program on their part.

TABLE 11

Evaluation of the Program
Corrective Reading Teachers
N = 106

Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a. Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program	4.22	.89	104
b. Physical facilities provided by the school	3.68	1.22	106
c. Time alloted for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction	3.55	1.20	106
d. Number of pupils in each group	3.62	1.24	105
e. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading	4.11	1.01	105
f. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visuals aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program	4.42	.77	106
g. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading	3.69	1.05	103
h. Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading	3.46	1.09	104
i. Communication between classroom teacher and yourself	3.87	1.08	1.05
j. Reinforcement of reading program activities in the home classroom	2.83	.99	89
k. Cooperation of school personnel	4.36	.94	106
l. Supervision of program by reading supervisors and reading coordinator	4.36	.92	105
m. Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques	2.57	1.02	104

[a]Number of respondents to a given area.

A sampling of comments made by the reading teachers reveal their overall impressions.

"Improvement shown is most gratifying and worthwhile."

"It would be beneficial if there were *organized* communications between the classroom teachers of the pupils who are receiving corrective reading and CRT."

"More pooling of techniques in an intellectually open atmosphere."

"The Title I faculty of each school should meet periodically so that the whole child may be treated."

"I feel that the strength and improvement of this program depends greatly on a clearer understanding among all the members of the program, i.e., the school, the Board of Education office, the field supervisor, and the teacher."

The responses of the corrective reading teachers to the questions dealing with their participation in the program, overall impressions, and interest in future participation are reported in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Participation and General Impressions
Corrective Reading Teachers

N = 106

Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Did you participate in this program last year (1968-1969)?	Yes	79	75
	No	27	25
2. Did you participate in this school or in another school?	This school	70	89
	No response	9	11
3. What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program This year's program is:	Inferior	–	–
	About the same	40	51
	Superior	38	48
	No response	1	1
4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?	Yes	98	92
	Not sure	5	5
	No	2	2
	No response	1	1

Seventy-five percent of the respondents participated in last year's program, and almost all of them did so in the same school. Of the seventy-nine teachers who participated in last year's program, 48 percent thought this year's program to be superior, while 51 percent considered this year's program about the same as last year's.

In conclusion, the fact that 92 percent of the teachers expressed the wish to participate in a similar program next year, may be taken as a strong indication that they perceive favorably the program and their role in it.

Classroom Teachers. The principal in each of the 158 non-public schools was supplied with a sufficient number of Classroom Teacher Questionnaire to distribute to those classroom teachers whose students participated in the reading program. Seven hundred and forty responses were received. A random sample of two hundred of these responses was selected for analysis.

The teachers were asked to rate five aspects of the program on a five-point scale from "unsatisfactory" to "very satisfactory." Their ratings are summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Evaluation of the Program
Classroom Teachers

N = 200

Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
a. Selection procedures for pupils in corrective reading program	4.48	1.77	200
b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction	3.69	1.13	194
c. Services of the reading teacher	3.48	1.18	195
d. Communication between the reading teacher and yourself	4.22	.98	197
e. Application of regular classroom activities in the reading program	3.19	1.14	186

[a]Number of respondents to a given area

All areas received mean ratings above average, the highest rating (4.48) being for item a, dealing with the selection of pupils to the program. It is interesting to note that the classroom teachers gave a higher rating to the item dealing with communication with the reading teachers (d) as compared to the ratings given this item by the reading teachers (mean of classroom teachers = 4.42; mean of reading teachers = 3.87). Apparently, the classroom teacher felt more satisfied with the degree of communication. As might be expected, the classroom teachers, as compared to the reading teachers, also gave a higher rating to the item dealing with the application of regular class activities in the reading activities (mean of classroom teachers = 3.19; mean of reading teachers = 2.83). It should be noted, however, that this item received the lowest mean rating by the classroom teachers. Evidently, even the classroom teachers were less satisfied with this area as compared to the other areas rated. A classroom teacher comment which reflects the reaction to this area is as follows:

> "Remedial programs (Math or Reading) should be correlated more effectively with the regular school program for the benefit of the child. The remedial educator should be responsible for such correlations and suggested outside assignments for the child."

Pupil participation and general impressions of the classroom teachers are reported in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Pupil Participation and General Impressions
Classroom Teachers'

N = 200

Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Did your pupils participate in this program last year?	Yes	160	80
	No	40	20
2. How would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:	Inferior	3	2
	About the same	109	68
	Superior	25	16
	No response	23	14
3. Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year?	Yes	169	84.5
	Not sure	23	11.5
	No	4	2
	No response	4	2

Eighty percent of the teachers reported that their students participated in last year's program and 84% indicated that they would be interested in their pupils' participation in a similar program next year. It is of interest to contrast the comparisons of last year's and this year's program made by the classroom teachers and the reading teachers. While 48% of the latter perceived this year's program as superior to last year's, only 16% of the former perceived this year's program as superior. The discrepancy between the two groups lies in the categories of "about the same" and "no response." Fourteen percent of the classroom teachers did not respond to this item, as compared to 1% of the reading teachers who did not respond. Sixty-eight percent of the classroom teachers, as compared to 51% of the reading teachers, considered the program during the two years "about the same." Neither group, however, perceived, to any noticeable degree, this year's program as inferior to last year's program.

The generally positive reactions of the classroom teachers to the reading program may be noted by a sampling of teacher comments which follow.

> "I feel the program was advantageous for my slower students. The students who were in the program participate more in my classroom reading program."
>
> "I feel that the corrective reading program is essential for our children. I can see a great improvement in the children who are in this class. The small group class in reading enables the child to gain confidence in himself and thus he is able to participate more actively when he re-enters the regular class for the remaining subjects."

Many of the classroom teachers recommended that the reading program be expanded from two days of instruction for the children to four or five days. At the present time, however, a maximum of two hours of instruction is mandated in the guidelines. This time limit (two hours per child) is equivalent to the amount of special reading instruction given to children in public schools.

Principals. The principals in all of the non-public schools receiving corrective reading services were asked to rate seven items pertaining to the program. One hundred and three principals responded to the questionnaire. In Table 15 are reported the means and standard deviations of the principals' evaluations of the seven areas.

TABLE 15

Evaluation of Program
Principals

N = 103

Item	Mean	SD	
a. Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program	3.78	1.18	101
b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction	3.21	1.18	103
c. Services of the reading teacher	4.22	.99	103
d. Materials supplied for the program	4.17	.94	103
e. On-going supervision by reading supervisors and reading coordinator	4.12	.88	103
f. Cooperation of reading teacher with school personnel	4.39	.98	103
g. Involvement of parents	2.51	1.05	101

[a]number of respondents to a given area

It will be noted from Table 15 that, except for the item dealing with parental involvement, all the aspects of the program received ratings above average. Parental involvement was given a mean rating of 2.51. Another relatively low rating (a mean of 3.21) was given to the item dealing with time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction. It seems, therefore, that while the principals believe the program to be quite satisfactory, they do not feel that enough time is allocated to it, and that the involvement of parents is satisfactory. These ratings are similar to the rating given to the item on time allocation by the classroom teachers (mean of 3.69) and to the rating given to parental involvement by the reading teachers (mean of 2.57).

Item c, dealing with the services of the reading teacher received a higher rating by the principals (mean of 4.22) than by the classroom teachers (mean of 3.48). Apparently, the principals were generally more satisfied with the services of the reading teacher than were the classroom teachers.

A sampling of principals' comments reflect their general attitude toward the program.

"We found the Reading Program very effective. Many children attained a high degree of self-confidence which they were lacking prior to the program."

"We were very pleased with the reading results this year. The children were very enthusiastic toward attending these classes."

"I feel the program would be more effective if we had the services of the CRT every day instead of twice a week."

"A major criticism of the program is that children who need remedial help should have daily work in the program. This would not only allow for continuity in the child's daily education, but would also benefit the entire school program. The remedial program should be an integral part of the school curriculum and the whole school reading program, rather than a twice a week experience for children."

Ninety-three percent of the principals indicated that their school participated in last year's (1968-1969) program. Those who participated were asked to evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's. Two percent thought this year's program was inferior, 71% considered this year's program about the same as last year's, 23% considered this year's program superior to last year's program, while 4% failed to respond to the question. Ninty-four percent of the principals indicated that they would be interested in their school participating next year in a similar program. Two percent said they were not interested, two percent were not sure, while two percent failed to respond.

Some principals noted that they would prefer one reading teacher servicing their school instead of two reading teachers as is the case in a limited number of schools. In addition, many principals stressed the importance of having the same reading teacher return for the 1970-1971 school year to perserve the continuity of the program. In summary, the overwhelming majority of principals are interested in the continuation of the program.

Project Coordinator and Reading Supervisors. Seven reading supervisors and the project coordinator were asked to rate nine aspects of the program during an interview conducted by the evaluation director. In addition, they were asked to describe the nature of the in-service training and supervision (See pp. 17-19). Specific strengths and weaknesses of the program were discussed with the evaluation director.

The rating of the field supervisors and the project coordinator are reported in Table 16. Due to the small number of responses, it was felt that a frequency of ratings of each aspect would better reflect the evaluation of the supervisors, than would means and standard deviations.

TABLE 16

Evaluation of the Reading Program Supervisors and Project Coordinator

N = 8

	Item	Frequency				
		Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average	Very Satisfactory
a.	Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program	–	–	–(pc)[a]	1	6
b.	Physical facilities provided by the school	–	1	3(pc)	2	1
c.	Time alloted for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction	–	1	3(pc)	1	2
d.	Number of pupils in each group	–	–	–	4	3(pc)
e.	Materials and instruments applied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading	–	–	–	4	3(ps)
f.	Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program	–	–	–(pc)	3	4
g.	Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading	–	–	4(pc)	2	1
h.	Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading	–	–	–(pc)	2	5
i.	Communication between classroom Teacher and yourself.	–	1	2(pc)	3	1

[a](pc) indicates ratings given to the 9 items by the project coordinator.

From their responses, it is evident that the evaluations of the field supervisors are generally favorable. In no case was an aspect of the program rated "unsatisfactory". Only three aspects of the program received a rating of "barely satisfactory", each with a frequency of one. Two of these aspects (time allocated and number of pupils) are determined by the guidelines for the corrective reading program. Most of the ratings are in the categories of "above average" and "very satisfactory." It is interesting to note the placement of the project coordinator's ratings in relation to the field supervisors. Generally, the coordinator evaluated the program as average with the exception of "materials" and "number of pupils" which were rated very satisfactory.

In response to the interview questions, all of the field supervisors indicated that this year's program was more effective than the 1968-69 program. Among the reasons given were increased teacher experience, greater awareness of teacher needs on the part of the supervisors, familiarity and effective use of materials, and increased feelings of security on the part of CRT to handle reading problems.

The field supervisors noted that one of the major strengths of the program was their relationship with the reading teachers on a small group or a one to one basis. The ability to individualize training to the special needs of the CRT was an essential component of the program. Flexible schedules on the part of the field supervisors enabled them to pinpoint problem areas and offer immediate assistance. The distribution of materials was effectively handled by the field supervisors although some systematic approach to the problem of shifting materials from one school to another might be considered.

Generally, the field supervisors felt that smaller groups of pupils and a longer time period for reading instruction would be beneficial to the pupils. However, as noted above, these areas are mandated by the guidelines to conform to the policy in the public schools and, therefore, cannot be changed at this time.

Overall, the field supervisors evaluated the program very positively and would like to continue in the program.

Parents' Reactions to Program

To assess the degree of parental involvement in the program and their reaction to the program, a letter and brief questionnaire were distributed to pupils in corrective reading classes to give to their parents. The letter and questionnaire, in English and Spanish, were distributed to approximately 2,200 children in thirty schools which were selected to represent various ethnic groups and neighborhoods in the city.

The questionnaire attempted to determine the amount of parental involvement through attendance at workshops, group meetings, and individual parent-teacher conferences. In addition, parents responded to two questions which were designed to ascertain their reaction to the reading program itself. A total of 223 questionnaires were returned by mail to the evaluation team. Of the 223 responses, forty-six were in Spanish.

The responses are reported in Table 17. It is first of all important to note that only slightly over 10% of the parents responded to the questionnaire.

TABLE 17

Parents' Responses
N = 223

Question	Category	Frequency	percent
1. Did you attend any parent workshops?	Yes	30	13
	No	193	87
2. How many parent workshops did you attend?	1	7	3
	2	6	3
	3	2	1
	5	4	2
	8	2	1
	No Response	202	90
3. Did you find the workshops useful?	Yes	30	13
	No response	193	87
4. Reason for not attending workshop	a. At work when workshop was held	44	20
	b. Not invited	96	43
	c. Other reason	44	20
	d. No response	39	17
5. Did you have any individual conferences with the reading teacher?	Yes	48	22
	No	175	78

TABLE 17 (Cont.)

Parent's Responses
N=233

5. (a)If yes, approximately how many?	1	21	9
	2	12	5
	3	5	2
	4	1	1
	5	3	1
	6	2	1
	No response	179	81
6. Did you attend any group meeting with the reading teacher and other parents?	Yes	24	11
	No	199	89
6. (a) If yes, how many?	1	11	5
	2	8	4
	3+	3	1
	No response	201	90
7. Do you think the special reading program was helpful to your child?	Yes	175	78
	Not sure	32	14
	No	8	4
	No response	8	4
8. Would you want your child to be in the reading program again next year?	Yes	175	78
	Not sure	25	11
	No	16	7
	No response	7	4

It is, of course, impossible to generalize to all parents whose children received corrective reading on the basis of these returns. Whether the respondents are more interested in the program than those parents who did not respond is also not possible to determine. Therefore, one should bear in mind that the following comments refer to the 223 parents who responded to the questionniare.

The most general statement that one could make is that a very small proportion of the parents was involved in any way in the program. Even those who stated that they attended workshops have done so only once or twice. Almost 90% never attended any workshops. It is interesting to note that those parents who did attend the workshops found them useful.

Among reasons given for not attending workshops, the largest category was "not invited" (43%). The same pattern of responses is displayed in reference to individual or group conferences with the reading teachers. In sum, very little contact existed between the parents and the school with regard to the special reading services.

It is interesting to note that 78% of the parents think that the program was helpful to their children, and expressed the desire that their children continue to participate in the program. Only 4% said that the program was not helpful to their children, while 7% indicated that they were not interested in their children participating in the program next year.

A sampling of parent comments tend to support the data noted above, e.g.,

> "I am delighted with the results of one year in the program. My son who had never shown an interest in reading, now reads for his pleasure."
>
> "This program gave my child confidence and benefited her immensely. She enjoyed it very much, and I felt she got the kind of help I could not provide."
>
> "I am a working mother and it wasn't possible for me to attend the meeting, but my son's reading has improved greatly."
>
> "El programa de lectura es muy bueno porque mi niño tiene la oportunidad de dedicare ese tiempo solamente a su lectura."

In summary, it is obvious that while practically not involved in the program, the majority of the parents considered the program helpful and expressed the wish that it be continued.

Pupil Evaluation

One of the major objectives of the project was to increase pupils' proficiency in reading and general achievement, and to stimulate motivation for school work. With this in mind, several aspects were evaluated. A Pupil Evaluation Form was filled out by the classroom teacher for randomly selected pupils who attended corrective reading classes on a regular basis. These data were collected only in the thirty schools involved in the site visits. The questionnaire asked for assessment of general achievement, motivation for school work, and attitude toward school. In addition, secondary school pupils (Grades 7 – 10) in the thirty schools answered a simple questionnaire to determine their attitude toward the special reading services that they were receiving.

To assess to what extent the corrective reading program increased pupils' proficiency in reading, a random sample of pre-test and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and Iowa Silent Reading Test were analyzed. Although it is possible to note the rate of growth in reading ability as measured by the above tests, the design does not permit a comparison of pupils who received corrective reading services with a comparative control group. Comparable data for pupils not in the reading program were not available to the evaluation team.

Evaluation by Classroom Teacher. Six hundred and thirty-nine pupil evaluation forms were returned to the evaluation team. The means and standard deviations of the ratings in the five areas are reported in Table 18.

The general impression one gets from Table 18 is that the classroom teachers indicate that there was about "average improvement" in the five areas. It should be noted, however, that the standard deviations are relatively large, indicating that there is a good deal of variability in the assessment of the teachers.

TABLE 18

Classroom Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils

N = 639

Item	Mean	SD	N[a]
Reading ability	4.27	1.68	638
Other school subjects	4.02	1.66	635
Study habits	3.78	1.76	637
Responsibility for outside assignments	3.91	1.81	637
Attitude toward school	4.35	1.79	638

[a]Number of respondants to a given area

It was felt that a study of the intercorrelations among the ratings may reveal whether there is a pattern of improvement in one area being associated with improvement in another area. The intercorrelations among the five areas are reported in Table 19.

TABLE 19

Intercorrelation Matrix of Teachers' Evaluation of Pupils

N = 639

	2	3	4	5
1. Reading Ability	.76 (635)	.64 (637)	.58 (637)	.61 (638)
2. Other School Subjects	–	.81 (634)	.74 (635)	.72 (635)
3. Study Habits	–	–	.86 (636)	.77 (637)
4. Responsibiltiy for Outside Assignments	–	–	–	.81 (637)
5. Attitude Toward School	–	–	–	–

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the sizes of groups responding.

The correlations are relatively high, ranging from .58 to .86. This implies that perceived gains in one area tend to be associated with perceived gains in the other areas.

Self-evaluation by Secondary School Pupils. This pupil questionnaire was administered (read orally) by either a member of the evaluation team or the corrective reading teacher in eleven schools in which the program included pupils in grades 7 – 10. One hundred and fifty pupils responded to six questions designed to elicit general impressions and evaluations of some specific areas related to the program.

Table 20 reports the background characteristics of those secondary school pupils who responded to the questionnaire.

TABLE 20

Background Characteristics

Pupils in Grades 7 – 10

N = 150

Item	Category	Frequency	Percent
Grade	7	66	44
	8	30	20
	9	24	16
	10	28	19
	No response	2	1
Sex	Male	53	35
	Female	97	65
Language spoken at home	English	99	66
	Other	51	34

The reactions of the secondary school pupils to the program are reported in Table 21. The general impression from the pupils' responses is that they view the program favorably.

TABLE 21

Evaluation of the Program
Pupils in Grades 7 – 10

N = 150

Question	Category	Frequency	Percent
1. Do you feel that going to the special reading class has helped you to improve your reading?	Yes	117	78
	Not sure	17	11
	No	16	11
2. Do you feel that you have improved in your other school subjects as a result of your being in the reading program?	Yes	79	53
	Not sure	42	28
	No	28	19
	No response	1	
3. Do you like to read more outside of school than you did before going to the reading class?	Yes	85	57
	No	65	43
4. Has going to the reading class helped you to study better?	Yes	99	66
	No	51	34
5. Did you participate in a similar reading program last year (1968-1969)?	Yes	108	72
	No	42	28
6. Would you like to participate in a reading program again next year?	Yes	52	35
	Not sure	44	29
	No	53	35
	No response	1	1

Seventy-eight percent felt that the program has helped them improve their reading, while only 11% felt that it did not. In the other categories, the discrepancies between the positive and negative responses are not as large, but in all but one case the positive responses exceed the negative ones by a sizable percentage. The only exception is in the item that deals with future participation. Thirty-five percent of the group indicated an interest in participating in a similar program next year while an equal number indicated that they did not wish to participate in a similar program next year. This relatively large number of

negative responses is not consistent with the generally favorable responses to the other items. It is of course possible that some of the students feel that they have improved sufficiently and need no further remediation. A more likely explanation is that pupils of this age group (ages 12 through 16) do not wish to be separated from their peers for a "special" activity which denotes some weakness on their part. Although the pupils realize the benefits derived from specialized reading instruction, many of them apparently would prefer not to attend a special reading class.

In any event, the majority of the secondary school pupils perceived the program as being helpful in the area of reading as well as in their general studies.

Evaluation of Pupils' Gains. As indicated earlier, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons of gains in reading. The procedure adopted, therefore, was as follows: (1) Assess the gains in comparison to what one would normally expect retarded readers to gain in a comparable period of time without taking part in a special remedial program: and (2) Tests of significance of mean gains.

It was further decided that the evaluation of gains will be performed only for students whose remedial work in the program started in the beginning of the 1969-70 school year. Seventeen hundred and twenty-six such students were identified. A random sample of 375 students was selected for the purpose of the analysis. For students in grades 2 through 8, initial and final scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Word Knowledge and Paragraph Meaning were available.

For the high school students total pre- and post-scores on the Iowa Silent Reading Test were available. The findings for grades 2 through 10 are reported in Table 22. It can be noted that in all grades the mean gains exceeded half a year.

In Word Knowledge (grades 2 – 8), the range of gains is from .63 to .77. In Paragraph Meaning (Grades 2 – 8), the range of gains is from .59 to .91. In general, there is a trend for greater gains in the area of Paragraph Meaning as compared to Word Knowledge. The gains of grades 9 and 10 on the total Iowa Silent Reading Test are 1.49.

Bond and Tinker (1969) point out that "normal children under average conditions of learning will gain approximately one grade in reading ability each school year. [p.12]." However, such is not the case for deficient readers in a regular classroom setting. Children

TABLE 22

Test of Significance of Gains in Reading

Grade	N	Word Knowledge						Paragraph Meaning					
		Mean Pre-Test	SD Pre	Mean Post-Test	SD Post	Gain	t	Mean Pre-Test	SD Pre	Mean Post	SD Post	Gain	t
2	58	1.82	.53	2.50	.46	.68	10.06	1.73	.45	2.54	.58	.81	11.23
3	126	2.15	.51	2.79	.56	.64	12.05	2.06	.49	2.97	.59	.91	17.76
4	79	2.55	.54	3.19	.71	.64	8.77	2.60	.53	3.19	.62	.59	9.12
5	50	3.04	.61	3.67	.81	.63	6.52	3.02	.71	3.76	.78	.74	8.98
6	41	3.87	.93	4.64	1.11	.77	6.78	3.66	.78	4.45	1.31	.79	5.08
7 & 8	21	4.36	1.37	5.02	1.59	.66	4.67	4.00	1.14	4.69	1.50	.69	2.99[b]
9 & 10[a]	150	7.14	1.48	8.63	1.81	1.49	13.50						

[a] Grades 9 and 10 were tested on the Iowa Silent Reading Test for which total pre-test and post-test scores were reported.

[b] Except for this t ratio which is significant beyond .01, all other t ratios reported in the table are significant beyond .001.

receiving remedial instruction should approximate normal gains in reading ability, but even this is not always the case. Naturally, in individual cases, the rate of improvement may vary greatly. Considering the amount of time each child spent in the reading class (approximately two hours per week for eight months) the gains noted in Table 22 are very impressive.

It is interesting to note that in the elementary grades the greatest gains in Paragraph Meaning were in second and third grade. This finding supports other studies in the literature. Chansky (1963) found that younger remedial pupils tended to respond better to specialized instruction than older pupils. Albert Harris (1970, p. 303) notes a recent study by Dr. Gilbert B. Shiffman in which he concluded that the earlier the grade at which remediation was started, the better. Harris also states that:

> "The earlier the child enters such a program, the shorter the distance he has to go. Also, his experience of failure has been for a shorter priod of time, and emotional defenses and resistances have usually not become crystallized as yet. Successful remedial teaching should bring a child in these grades to a satisfactory reading performance in considerably less time than is required for upper-grade children and thus involve a substantial economy of teacher time [p. 303]."

Based on the data obtained for this evaluation and the current research literature, it is suggested that priority in selecting children for remedial work be set at second and third grade.

Further examination of Table 22 indicates that the means on the post-test are still relatively low despite significant gains. For many students in this group who entered the reading program in the Fall of 1969, further remedial work may be indicated.

In summary, then, the gains for all grades were not only statistically significant, but also meaningful in the light of expectation of gains when no special remedial work is instituted.

Comparisons Between Two Programs. In two schools, several groups were given five days a week remedial work instead of the two days a week given to all other students. For the purpose of comparisons, students were selected from schools which were described as relatively similar to those in which the five-day program was carried out. Students were matched on sex and number of years involved in the remedial reading program. Due to the small numbers available, grades 4 and 5 were combined, as were grades 7 and 8. An analysis

of convariance, using the pre-test scores as the covariate was performed for each of the two groups with their matched controls.

The results of the analysis of gains in Word Knowledge are reported in Table 23.

As can be noted in Table 23, grades 4 and 5 showed a gain of .83 in Word Knowledge for the five-days a week groups as compared to a gain of .59 for the two-days a week group. The difference between the gains in .24, and is not statistically significant. It is interesting to note, however, that while the standard deviation of the five-days a week group on the pre-test is 2.08, the standard deviation of the same group for the post-test is 1.12. This indicates that at the end of the year the group was more homogeneous than in the beginning. The reverse pattern is exhibited for the two days a week group. The standard deviation on their pre-test was 1.62, while the standard deviation on their post-test is 2.53. It appears that among the five days a week 4th and 5th graders, the gains were less varied around the mean gain, while for the two days a week group, there was greater variability in gains.

The findings for the 7th and 8th graders are not consistent with those of the 4th and 5th grades. In fact, the two days a week group was shown to gain .16 more than the five days a week group. One should, of course, bear in mind that this finding is based on sixteen students in each group. Some general observations about this phase of the evaluation will be made after the presentation of the findings about gains in Paragraph Meaning.

The results dealing with Paragraph Meaning are reported in Table 24.

It will be noted from Table 24 that the five days a week group showed a slightly larger gain than did the two days a week group in Paragraph Meaning for grades 4 and 5. The difference for grades 7 and 8 is more noticeable. While the two days a week group showed a gain of .05, the five days a week group showed a gain of .65. Again, one should bear in mind that in the 7th and 8th grade groups, the number of students is only sixteen. The difference in gains for Paragraph Meaning was not statistically significant for either the 4th-5th grade groups or the 7th-8th grade groups.

In summary, it should be noted that the comparisons performed could not be considered more than loosely suggestive. The comparison groups were selected from schools that were considered "similar." One cannot, however, account for any differences that may

TABLE 23

Analysis of Covariance of Gains
in Word Knowledge

	Five-days a week group						Two-days a week group						Differences [a] in gains	F	df
Grades	N	Mean Pre	SD Pre	Mean Post	SD Post	Gain	N	Mean Pre	SD Pre	Mean Post	SD Post	Gain			
4 & 5	43	2.89	2.08	3.72	1.12	.83	43	2.70	1.62	3.29	2.53	.59	.24	1.94	1,83 (N.S.)
7 & 8	16	3.59	1.05	4.23	1.52	.64	16	4.02	1.09	4.82	1.48	.80	−.16	< 1	1,29

[a] Mean gain of five-days a week group minus mean gain of two days a week group

TABLE 24

Analysis of Covariance of Gains
in Paragraph Meaning

	Five-days a week group						Two-days a week group						Differences [a] in Gains	F	df
Grades	N	Mean Pre	SD Pre	Mean Post	SD Post	Gain	N	Mean Pre	SD Pre	Mean Post	SD Post	Gain			
4 & 5	43	3.02	2.24	3.73	2.71	.71	43	2.89	2.01	3.47	2.52	.58	.13	1.45	1,83 (N.S.)
7 & 8	16	3.21	1.83	3.86	2.56	.65	16	4.36	1.83	4.41	1.21	.05	.60	< 1	

[a] Mean gain of five days a week group minus mean gain of two days a week group.

exist between competence of teachers, motivation of teachers and students, and a host of other variables that may interact with the variations in the number of days a week the program is conducted. In order to assess the effectiveness of such a program, controls would have to be instituted before its inception, and great care would have to be taken in its execution and evaluation.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This evaluation of corrective reading services in the non-public schools contains three major components. The report has:

(1) described the implementation of the program in a stratified sample of 30 schools;
(2) assessed the reactions of the professional staff, and parents to the program;
(3) considered several aspects of pupils, evaluation including an analysis of reading test scores.

The data collected yield the following conclusions:

1. Observation of the program in a stratified sample of 30 schools indicates that the program was implemented in both the elementary and secondary schools as outlined in the project proposal.
2. Ratings of the 30 schools in respect to their physical facilities, pupil evaluation, materials, planning, teaching procedures, and the functioning of the teachers and pupils in the program show a good deal of variability across the schools. In general, the pattern of ratings tend toward the higher ratings with the exception of physical facilities which were rated low for seven schools.
3. Assessment of reading teachers' background and experience indicates that the majority of the teachers have taken courses relevant to the teaching of corrective reading but have limited experience in teaching reading. This lack of experience is expected in the light of the guidelines used to select Title I teachers.
4. Training of the reading teachers was extensive and well implemented. The majority of the reading teachers reported that the training they received was relevant to their work in the reading program.

5. Evaluation of the program by field supervisors, reading teachers, classroom teachers and principals was generally favorable. The item that received the lowest rating dealt with parental involvement. The overwhelming majority of the professional staff expressed the desire to participate in a similar program next year.
6. Reaction of parents to the program was positive although their actual involvement was minimal. The majority of the parents considered the program helpful and wanted it to be continued.
7. Evaluation by the classroom teachers of their pupils who attended the reading program indicated that there was about "average improvement" in areas concerned with reading ability, other school subjects, study habits, outside assignments, and attitude toward school.
8. Self-Evaluation by secondary school pupils showed a positive response toward the program. However, a relatively large number of pupils (35 percent) indicated that they did not wish to participate in a similar program next year.
9. Analysis of reading test scores yielded significant gains from initial to final scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (grades 2 through 8) and on the Iowa Silent Reading Test (grades 9 – 10). However, no control group was available for the purpose of comparisons.
10. Comparisons between two different programs (five days a week remedial work and two days a week) did not yield any significant differences. The groups involved in this analysis were relatively small and many variables other than the number of days a week the program was conducted may have been in operation.

In summary, then, the reading program was favorably perceived by the evaluation team, the professional staff, parents and pupils. An analysis of the reading test scores attests to the overall effectiveness of the program.

The following specific recommendations are made with a view toward improving a sound program:

1. A controlled experimental study to be conducted and that the design for the program be developed prior to the initial selection of the pupils for the remedial program.
2. The experimental five days a week program be expanded to several additional schools and that a controlled experiment be set up prior to its inception.
3. Priority in the selection of new pupils entering the remedial program be given to

children in second and third grade. The research literature indicates that younger children tend to respond better to remedial instruction than older children.

4. Methods for increasing parental involvement in the program be studied. Some possibilities are parent observation of the reading program, parent workshop or teacher-parent conferences during evening hours, increased participation of CRT in regular school meetings which involve parents, brief written progress reports on a monthly basis, a school newsletter highlighting reading activities outside of the classroom, and the organization of a parent committee. A parent group might work with the CRT to develop some plans for increasing parent participation in the remedial reading program.
5. In-service training for the school year 1970-71 to stress the following: planning for small group and individual pupil needs, ways of attaining greater pupil interaction, methods of eliciting information from pupils, techniques for fostering independent reading and methods of increasing parental involvement.
6. The concept of a reading laboratory be considered for the secondary schools in an attempt to change the negative attitute of many of these pupils toward attending remedial reading classes. Consideration might be given to permitting pupils other than those specifically selected for remedial work to use the reading laboratory on a voluntary basis. This type of setup might offset some of the stigma attached to remedial reading classes.
7. Coordination between reading activities in the regular classroom and in the reading room be improved. Scheduled weekly conferences between the CRT and the non-public school teacher and/or observation of the reading program by the classroom teacher might be considered.
8. Staff assignments be adjusted where possible so that only one reading teacher would service a given school. It is further recommended that teachers in 1970-71 return to the same school they served in 1969-70 so as to insure program continuity.
9. Additional audio-visual materials and library books about minority groups be given to the remedial reading program. In addition, it is suggested that the Informal Textbook Test be revised.
10. The physical facilities in those schools that were rated below average be upgraded.

REFERENCES

Bond, G.F. and Tinker, M.A. Reading difficulties: their diagnosis and correction New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Chansky, N.M. Age, I.Q. and improvement in reading. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1963, *56*, 439-442.

Harris, A.J. Improvement of reading ability. New York: David McKay, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Observer Check List

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Observer Check List

School _____ Grade _____ Group _____

CRT _____ Number Boys _____ Girls _____

Observer _____ Date _____

	Yes	No
A. Physical Facilities		
1. Separate area for reading program	_____	_____
2. Size of area adequate	_____	_____
3. Space available for small group work	_____	_____
4. Space available for individual work	_____	_____
5. Storage facilities adequate	_____	_____
6. Chalkboard available	_____	_____
7. Area attractive	_____	_____
8. Adequate physical provisions (lights, ventilation, etc.)	_____	_____

Overall Rating of Facilities 1 2 3 4 5

B. Materials		
1. Variety of materials being used.		
a. Basal readers	_____	_____
b. Workbooks	_____	_____
c. Trade books	_____	_____
d. Magazines	_____	_____
e. Newspapers	_____	_____
f. Content-area materials	_____	_____
g. Other	_____	_____
2. Teacher–made materials	_____	_____
3. Audio–visual aids	_____	_____
4. Interest level appropriate to age and maturity of pupils	_____	_____
5. Level of materials suitable to reading ability of pupils	_____	_____
6. Differentiation between instructional level and independent level materials	_____	_____
7. Attractive in appearance	_____	_____
8. Sufficient quantity		

Overall Rating of Materials 1 2 3 4 5

	Yes	No
C. Evaluation		
1. Use of Informal Reading Inventory	_____	_____
2. Standardized Reading Test upon admission to program	_____	_____
3. Standardized Reading Test at end of school year	_____	_____
4. On-going informal evaluation of errors in work recognition	_____	_____
5. On-going diagnosis of errors in comprehension	_____	_____
6. Evaluation of deficiencies in study skills	_____	_____

Overall Rating of Evaluation _____ 1 2 3 4 5

D. Planning		
1. Evidence of planned sequence in skill development	_____	_____
2. Planning of skill lessons based on on-going diagnosis of deficiencies	_____	_____
3. Evidence of planned varied activities for individual and small group needs	_____	_____
4. Application materials and assignments differentiated for individual and group needs	_____	_____

Overall Rating of Planning _____ 1 2 3 4 5

E. Teaching Procedures		
1. Background, readiness, or concept building where appropriate to lesson	_____	_____
2. Specific skill teaching in		
a. work recognition	_____	_____
b. comprehension	_____	_____
c. study skills	_____	_____
3. Appropriate application following development of a specific skill	_____	_____
4. Questions differentiated to include various types of meanings – literal, interpretation, critical evaluation	_____	_____
5. Grouping of activities (small group or individual) for special needs	_____	_____
6. Procedures appropriate to maturity and ability of pupils	_____	_____
7. Use of class time – spacing, number	_____	_____
8. Integration of reading with content areas	_____	_____

Overall Rating of Teaching Procedures _____ 1 2 3 4 5

	Yes	No
F. The Teacher		
1. Appears enthusiastic	_____	_____
2. Establishes a good rapport with pupils (relaxed, informal, confident)	_____	_____
3. Encourages all pupils to participate	_____	_____
4. Instills confidence in pupils – uses positive reinforcement	_____	_____
Overall Rating of the Teacher	1 2 3 4 5	
G. The Pupils		
1. Arrive promptly for reading instruction	_____	_____
2. Actively respond during reading period	_____	_____
3. Interaction among pupils	_____	_____
4. Show interest in independent reading	_____	_____
Overall Rating of Pupil interest in program	1 2 3 4 5	

Observer's Comments

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

Reading Teacher Background Form

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Reading Teacher Background Form

School_____ Date_____
Reading Teacher_____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

A. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Year	Institution	Major Field

B. COURSE WORK RELEVANT TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those courses which you have taken and indicate the institution and year.

Content of Course	Institution	Year
_____Foundations of Reading Instruction		
_____Diagnostic Techniques – Reading		
_____Corrective Reading Instruction		
_____Reading in the Content Areas		
_____Teaching Individualized Reading		
Other		

C. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

School	Grades	No. of Years	Regular or Substitute

D. EXPERIENCES SPECIFIC TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those experiences which you have had and the number of years.

	Experience	No. of Years
____	Corrective Reading – Public Schools	
____	After–school Tutorial Reading Program	
____	Parent–volunteer Reading Tutor	
____	Private tutorial work in Reading	

Other

APPENDIX C

Reading Teacher In-service Training Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Corrective Reading Teacher In-service Training Questionnaire

SCHOOL_____ GRADE_____

READING TEACHER _____ DATE_____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

1. How many in-service Corrective Reading Teacher-training sessions did you attend? _____

2. How many hours (approximately) of training did you receive? _____

3. If you did not attend any training sessions, state the reason.

_____

_____

4. In your opinion, was the amount of in-service training sufficient?

Yes _____ No _____

5. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1968-69)?

Yes _____ No _____

6. Did you participate in the in-service training last year?

Yes _____ No _____

7. If your answer to question 6 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's sessions in comparison to last year's sessions?

On the whole this year's training sessions were:

a. Inferior _____

b. About the same _____

c. Superior _____

Instructions: Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the training sessions. Use the following system to evaluate the relevancy of the information received to your experience in teaching corrective reading. If you think the information received was very satisfactory put a 5 in the space provided before the topic. If you think the information received was above average, put a 4 before it. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the numbers so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. For any item that was not covered during the training sessions, write NC (Not Covered) in the space provided for the ratings.

Rating

_____ a. Methods of corrective instruction

_____ b. Use of instructional materials

_____ c. Techniques of evaluation

_____ d. Specific procedures for diagnosis

_____ e. Techniques for parent involvement

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF TRAINING SESSIONS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Reading Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

School _____ Grade _____

Reading Teacher _____ Date _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 13 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a 5 in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selective procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program.
_____ b. Physical facilities provided by the school.
_____ c. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.
_____ d. Number of pupils in each group.
_____ e. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.
_____ f. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program.
_____ g. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.
_____ h. Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.
_____ i. Communication between classroom teacher and yourself.
_____ j. Reinforcement of reading program activities in the home classroom.
_____ k. Cooperation of school personnel.
_____ l. Supervision of program by reading supervisors and reading coordinator.
_____ m. Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques.

1. Did you participate in the training sessions? Yes____ No____

2. Did you participate in this program last year (1968-1969)?
Yes____ No____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, answer a. and b. below:

   a. Did you participate in this school?____or in another school?____
   b. What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's program is

   _____ inferior _____ about the same _____ superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

   Yes_____ No_____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

APPENDIX E

Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Classroom Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire

School_____ Grade_____

Classroom Teacher_____ Date_____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 5 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a 5 in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____a. Selection procedures for pupils in corrective reading program.
_____b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.
_____c. Services of the reading teacher.
_____d. Communication between the reading teacher and yourself.
_____e. Application of regular classroom activities in the reading program.

---

1. Did your pupils participate in this program last year (1968-69)?
   Yes _____ No _____

2. If your answer to question 1 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is: a. inferior_____ b. about the same_____ c. superior _____

3. Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year? Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Principal Evaluation Questionnaire

SCHOOL _____ DATE _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 7 items about the Corrective Reading Program in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a 5 in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	average	above average	very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program
_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction
_____ c. Services of the reading teacher
_____ d. Materials supplied for the program
_____ e. On-going supervision by reading supervisors and reading coordinator
_____ f. Cooperation of reading teacher with school personnel
_____ g. Involvement of parents

1. Did your school participate in this program last year (1968-69)? Yes_____ No _____
2. If your answer to question 1 is Yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:
   a. inferior_____ b. about the same _____ c. superior_____
3. Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?
   Yes_____ No_____ Not sure_____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX G

Reading Supervisor Interview Form

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

READING SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW FORM

School_____ Date_____

Reading Supervisor_____ Grade_____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Listed below are 9 items about the Corrective Reading Progam in Non-Public Schools. Use the following system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program. If you think an item was very satisfactory, put a 5 in the space provided before the item. Use the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 similarly, the amount of judged satisfaction decreasing with the number so that 1 would mean unsatisfactory. These categories are further illustrated on the following rating scale.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	Barely satisfactory	Average	Above average	Very satisfactory

Rating

_____ a. Selection procedures for pupils in the corrective reading program.
_____ b. Time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction.
_____ c. Number of pupils in each group.
_____ d. Materials and instruments supplied for diagnostic evaluation of individual strengths and weaknesses in reading.
_____ e. Materials (books, periodicals, audio-visual aids, etc.) supplied for the instructional program.
_____ f. Use of Informal Textbook Test to establish reading levels and evaluate growth in reading.
_____ g. Use of Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading.
_____ h. Cooperation of school personnel.
_____ i. Involvement of parents through individual and/or group conferences and other techniques.

1. Describe nature of in-service training program. (When conducted, # sessions, planning, goals, were they accomplished, special problems).

READING SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW FORM

3. Describe nature of the supervision (how often, formal, informal, teacher reaction).

3. Did you supervise program last year (1968-69)? Compare effectiveness of the programs.

4. General evaluation of program – specific strengths and weaknessess.

APPENDIX H

Parent Letter and Questionnaire

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses
51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598 2898

May 15, 1970

Dear Parent:

New York University has been evaluating the special reading program that your child attends. In order to get a complete picture of the program, your opinions and suggestions are needed.

Therefore, I am enclosing a questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your opinions and suggestions will enable the school to further improve the program for the benefit of your child. I, therefore, urge you to return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

LEONORE RINGLER
Associate Professor

Enclosures:
Parent Questionnaire
Self-Addressed Envelope

n

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-1212

Mayo 15, 1970

Estimados Padres:

La Universidad de New York ha estado evaluando el programa de lectura al que su hijo (a) asiste. Con el fin de obtener un panorama completo del programa, necesitamos sus opiniones y sugerencias al respecto.

Por este motivo, adjunto un cuestionario y el sobre respectivo. Sus opiniones y sugerencias permitirán que la escuela mejore aún más el programa en beneficio de su hijo(a).

Por lo tanto les ruego enviar el cuestionario a la brevedad posible.

Sus respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales.

Gracias por su cooperacion.

Muy Atentamente,

LEONORE RINGLER
Profesora Asociada

Inc.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Parent Questionnaire

School _____ Name of Pupil _____

Parent's Name _____ Date _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

1. Did you attend any parent workshops? Yes_____ No _____

2. How many parent workshops did you attend? _____ _____

3. Did you find the workshops useful? Yes_____ No _____

4. If you did not attend, give the reason.

   a. at work when workshop was held _____
   b. not invited _____
   c. other reason _____

5. Did you have any individual conferences with the reading teacher?
   Yes _____ No _____
   If yes, approximately how many? _____.

6. Did you attend any group meeting with the reading teacher and other parents? Yes_____ No_____ . If yes, how many? _____

7. Do you think the special reading program was helpful to your child?
   Yes _____ No _____ Not sure _____

8. Would you want your child to be in the reading program again next year? Yes____ No_____ Not sure _____

Please feel free to make any comment about the program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Programa para el mejoramiento de la lectura en Escuelas Privadas.

Cuestionario Para Los Padres

Escuela _____ Nombre del alumno _____

Nombre del padre o de la madre _____ Fecha _____

Por favor recuerde: Todas las respuestas serán estrictamente confidenciales y serán usadas solamente para evaluar el programa. Ninguna persona que no èste relacionada con la Escuela o el Departamento de Educacion tendrá acceso a esta informacion.

1– ¿Asistió usted a algunos de los talleres de padres? _____

2– ¿A cuàntos talleres de padres asistió usted? _____

3– ¿Encontrò usted ùtiles los talleres de padres? _____

4– Si usted no assistio, por favor indique la razòn.

a– Estaba trabajando cuando se afectuo el taller. _____
b– Nc recibiò invitaciòn _____
c– Otra razòn _____

5– ¿Tuvo usted alguna entrevista personal con la maestra de lectura?

_____

Si la respuesta es si, indique aproximadeamente cuàntas _____

6– ¿Atendiò usted a alguna reuniòn de grupo con la maestra de lectura y otros padres? _____ Si _____ No

Si la respuestas es si, indique approximadamente cuantas _____

7– ¿Cree usted que el programa especial de lectura fuò una ayuda para su hijo?
_____ Si _____ No _____ No es seguro.

8– ¿Desearia usted que su hijo estuviera nuevamente en el programa de lectura el pròximo año? _____ Si _____ No _____ No esseguro

Por favor, siètese libre para hacer cualquier comentario acerca del programa.

APPENDIX I

Pupil Evaluation Form

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

PUPIL EVALUATION FORM

School _____ Date _____

Pupil _____ Boy _____ Girl _____

Classroom Teacher _____ Reading Teacher _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or Board of Education will have access to these data.

Instructions: Based on your observation of those pupils who attended the corrective reading program, indicate your general impression of the pupils in the following areas:

a. Reading ability

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Gained a great deal

b. Other school subjects

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Gained a great deal

c. Study habits

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

d. Responsibility for outside assignments

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable gain			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

e. Attitude toward school

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No noticeable improvement			Average improvement			Improved a great deal

APPENDIX J

Pupil Questionnaire

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM IN NON–PUBLIC SCHOOLS

New York University
Center for Field Research

Pupil Questionnaire

School _____ Grade _____

Reading Teacher _____ Today's Date _____

Pupil's Name _____ Boy _____ Girl _____

Date of Birth _____
Mo. Yr.

Home Address _____

_____

Language spoken at Home _____

1. Do you feel that going to the special reading class has helped you to improve your reading?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

2. Do you feel that you have improved in your other school subjects as a result of your being in the reading program?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

3. Do you like to read more outside of school than you did before going to the reading class?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

4. Has going to the reading class helped you to study better?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____

5. Did you participate in a similar reading program last year (1968-69)?

   Yes _____ No _____

6. Would you like to participate in a reading program again next year?

   Yes _____ No _____ Not Sure _____